REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed June 21, 2007 the Examiner noted that claims 5 and 17-20 were pending and rejected claims 5 and 17-20. No claims have been amended, no claims have been canceled, no new claims have been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 5 and 17-20 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 5 and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,584,505 (Howard).

Claim 5 has been amended to recite:

> a transmitting device transmitting common certificate information in common with a plurality of services respectively provided by different business organizations, when the terminal unit of a user accesses a particular service of the plurality of services, to the certificating unit which manages the common certificate information corresponding to service information of available services that the user can access, **the available services including a first service provided through the service unit by a first business organization and a second service provided by a second business organization**, without requiring identification information or password information issued by the services;
> a service utilizing device receiving the service information of the available services from the certificating unit and providing the terminal unit of the user with layout data for displaying a screen including a display region corresponding to the service information of the available services received from the certificating unit, wherein service data respectively supplied by the **first and second services** are displayed in the display region; and
> a storing device storing the common certificate information and the identification information and the password information for the particular service.

By at least the aforementioned features, amended claim 5 recites a service server generating layout data required for displaying information supplied by another service server in a screen of the service server that has generated the layout data.

It is respectfully submitted that Howard does not teach the aforementioned features as recited in claim 5, for example. Rather, Howard discusses that when a user seeks to access affiliate servers, each of the affiliate servers is configured to redirect the user browser to a "sign-in" web page of an authentication server (see column 6, lines 53-63). The authentication server sets cookies and again redirects the user browser back to the initially accessed service server after confirming validity of data input using the "sign-in" web page. In Howard, it appears that a

user is required to provide "sign-in" information (i.e., identification or password information) to access the authentication server.

Further, on page 4 of the Office Action it is alleged that Howard, col. 5, lines 44-63 and col. 8, lines 38-44 teaches "a transmitting device transmitting common certificate information in common with a plurality of services respectively provided by different business organizations, when the terminal unit of a user accesses a particular service of the plurality of services, to the certificating unit which manages the common certificate information corresponding to service information of available services that the user can access, without requiring identification information or password information issued by the services." The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument. The cited art fails to teach or suggest "a plurality of services respectively provided by different business organizations…the available services including a first service provided through the service unit by a first business organization and a second service provided by a second business organization," as in amended claim 5.

The Office Action alleges that affiliate servers constitute different business organizations. However, Howard col. 3 lines 62 through col. 4 line 5 states:

> The term "affiliate server" is defined herein as a web server that has "registered" or otherwise established a relationship or affiliation with the authentication server 110. Each affiliate server 104, 106, and 108 includes a code sequence (not shown) that allows the affiliate server to communicate with the authentication server 110 when a user (who is also registered with the authentication server) requests access to the affiliate server. Additional details regarding the authentication process and the interaction between the client computer, the affiliate servers, and the authentication server are provided below.

Thus, Howard discusses what an affiliate server is and such a discussion is devoid of the mention of separate business organizations. Howard's discussion only mentions that a server has a relationship or affiliation with an authentication server to be an affiliate server. There is no mention that such a relationship or affiliation is between business organizations, but between servers. In any further Action, where the Office maintains that Howard discloses different business organizations, it is respectfully requested for purposes of compact prosecution, that the Examiner note, with specificity, the column and line number within Howard where separate business organizations are disclosed, as nothing currently cited could reasonably be interpreted to infer separate business organizations.

Further, on page 4 of the Office Action it is stated that Howard, col. 7, lines 54-67 and col. 8, lines 1-43 teach "a service utilizing device receiving the service information of the available

services from the certificating unit and providing the terminal unit of the user with layout data for displaying a screen including a display region corresponding to the service information of the **available services** received from the certificating unit, wherein **service data respectively supplied by the first and second services are displayed in the display region**," as in amended claim 5. (Emphasis added) The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument. The cited art fails to teach the first and second services provide service data to be displayed in the display region.

Moreover, Howard does not teach that the information is produced by the certifying unit. Howard, col. 7, lines 54-56 states

> After receiving the user's profile information, the affiliate server generates a personalized web page for the user and communicates the web page to the user's browser (step 216).

Thus, the affiliate server generates a web page. If the web page is produced by the affiliate server then, it is not produced by the certifying unit. Further, as the web page is produced by the affiliate server (as the Office Action has interpreted services of different business organizations to be "affiliate servers"), it only produces information for the service of a single affiliate server, not of the multiple services as in the present claims.

Claims 17-20 are different in type and scope than claim 5, but, the arguments as to the features above, apply likewise to claims 17-20. For at least the reason stated above, claims 5 and 17-20 are patentably distinguishable from Howard.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 102. It is also submitted that claims 5 and 17-20 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _____September 21, 2007_____ By: ___/John C. Garvey/___
John C. Garvey
Registration No. 28,607

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501